India

FOR THE

No. 115. New Series.] No. 209. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 1900. [Registered as a Newspaper.] Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 121
"Melancholy Meanness"... 124
"From Sea to Sea" 125
Our London Letter 125
Notes from Bombay 126
Letter to the Editor 127
The Famine in India 127
British Troops in India 128
The Late Mrs. Gostling 129
The London Indian Conference ... 129
Indian Affairs in Parliament:
Special Report 130
Advertisements 132

NOTES AND NEWS.

WE understand that Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., will at the invitation of the Political Committee of the National Liberal Club open a discussion at the Club on April 4 upon the famine in India.

The terrible mortality of cattle is recognised as one of the worst features of the present famine. We have been hearing for a long time of the great exportation of hides from the Province of Bombay. The Government have now furnished us with exact statistics. It appears that during the last five months 170,000 maunds of hides, 12,000 maunds of skins, and 13,000 maunds of horns have been sent out of the Province. If we assume that six hides go to an Indian maund, this would mean a loss of 1,020,000 beasts. During the six months ending December, 1898, the export of hides from Gujerat and Kathiawar was only six per cent. of what it had been during the five months of famine. In other words, this great mortality is due to that calamity alone.

The *Pioneer* continues to take a gloomy view of the prospect before famine-stricken India. Writing when the number receiving relief was approaching four millions, it says:—

> The hot weather has not yet set in, and we have to face the probability of this huge total being largely increased before the next monsoon rains. The expenditure, therefore, which the Government of India and the rulers of certain Native States have to provide for is unprecedentedly great; while the indirect loss to the country owing to uncultivated fields, the loss of cattle, and the deterioration in physique and stamina of the population in the affected areas cannot be calculated in crores of rupees.

Whatever may have been the case a few weeks ago, the *Pioneer* believes that now, owing to the effects of Lord Curzon's circular, "the vast majority of those on the relief lists are fully deserving of aid from the State." It is, however, far from reassuring to be told that "the public do not despair of success in the struggle."

The *Friend of India*, though it applauds the measures taken to deal with famine, boldly affirms that they leave "the greatest of all the permanent problems before the Government of India—the prevention of famine—untouched." It goes on to say:—

> At present, when the rains fail, a vast number of people are without the means to feed themselves. And the reasons are obvious. In the first place the mass of the population is dependent entirely upon one industry which is itself dependent on the rains, and in the second place the normal earnings of the cultivator are insufficient to leave a margin to provide for the catastrophe of a rain failure.

Our contemporary, though anxious to see greater economy in the cost of public administration, thinks that no one "with a sense of arithmetic" would believe the cost of government sufficient to account for the poverty of the cultivators. It rather considers improvements in agriculture the true remedy, and calls for the establishment of an Agricultural Department in India like that lately set up in Ireland. But it overlooks two considerations—first, the Tribute, which so enormously adds to the burden of the most expensive government in the world, and, secondly, the sequence of events in Ireland. The establishment of the new department there has been the result and not the cause of a desire for improvement, and this desire only arose, and could only arise, after the abolition of rack-renting.

The *Pioneer* opposes the suggestion of the *Overland Mail*, a paper which it speaks of as having in London so "deservedly a certain authority on Indian affairs," that the time has come when India should receive a grant from the British Exchequer. Yet the *Pioneer* admits that the alternative is a sterling loan raised in England, which, indeed, it describes as "a misfortune." Thus at the very time that it has been shown that India has kept up a large body of troops, not for its own use, but for the defence of the Empire, that impoverished country is to be saddled with an increased debt, and as a consequence an increased economic tribute to Europe.

From the Bombay Administration Report for 1898-99, it appears that re-assessment took place in fourteen districts with 1,508 villages, and that the increase amounted on an average to 27·4 per cent. on the old assessment in the Government villages, and 79·2 per cent. in the few alienated villages. Can it be pretended that there is no connexion between the rise of rent at each re-assessment and the poverty which drives the rayats to the relief works at the first pinch of famine? The *Champion* rightly speaks of the Survey Department as "at the very root of the agricultural impoverishment" of the Bombay Presidency.

Mr. Romesh Dutt has followed up his letter (Feb. 12) to the Viceroy on Land Settlements in the Central Provinces with another letter (February 20) on Land Settlements and Water-Rates in Madras. In the second letter he deals with three points. First, the virtual confiscation of the Madras rayat's right to retain his land perpetually without any increase of assessment, as long as he continues to fulfil his engagements. Such was the right established by Sir Thomas Munro, and so it was described in 1857 by the Madras Board of Revenue. But the Board's Standing Order I, para. 4, as amended on July 1, 1895, expresses a very different view:—

> At each settlement or re-settlement of a District, Government will fix at its discretion the period for which such settlement or re-settlement shall be in force. The Collector shall then notify the period in the District Gazette and explain to the rayats that the new rates will not be liable to alteration during the currency of the settlement period; but that on the expiry of the said period, Government reserves to itself the right to revise the assessment in such manner as may then seem just and proper, either with reference solely to a rise or fall in prices, or with reference also to other considerations such as would require a re-classification of soils or a re-calculation of the grain outturns.

Urged by the lesson of the famine of 1877, and following in the line favoured by Lords Mayo and Northbrook, Lord Ripon in his despatch of October 17, 1882, "laid down the principle that, in districts which had once been surveyed and assessed by the settlement department, assessments should undergo no further revision except on the sole ground of a rise in prices." This decision was accepted by the Madras Government in 1883; but it was vetoed by the Secretary of State in his despatch of Jan. 8, 1885—"for the people of Madras, one of the saddest documents ever issued from London." Mr. Dutt invites Lord Curzon to re-establish the wise decision of Lord Ripon.

Mr. Dutt's second point is: "That, in revising assessments, one-fifth of the gross produce (and not one-half of the net produce) be accepted as the maximum of rent." The net produce is now ascertained by deducting from the gross produce the estimated cost of cultivation, and this estimate gives opportunity for calculations very oppressive to the rayat. There is no such opportunity in the case of the gross produce; and, besides, "there is not a cultivator in India who does not recognise 3 annas in the rupee of gross produce as fair rent." Mr. Dutt's third point is: "That the water-rate within the wet cultivation area be not made compulsory in Madras, as it has never been proposed to make it compulsory in Bengal." A Bill to make it compulsory is now pending in the Madras Legislative Council. The "Statement of Objects and Reasons" says

that "where a field is in the midst of wet cultivation, any attempt to exclude the water is frustrated by percolation." Mr. Dutt disputes the sufficiency of the reason, on experience elsewhere in India. Besides, "a compulsory water-rate has been repeatedly condemned by the highest authorities," including two Secretaries of State. Further, "it is proposed in the Bill not only to alter the law and to make the water-rate compulsory within wet cultivation areas, but also to bar the jurisdiction of the High Court and all Civil Courts in cases relating to assessments of water-rate made by the Collector"—a piece of insolence that should carry its own condemnation. We have every confidence that Lord Curzon will look into these most important questions with his own eyes.

Mr. Redford tells a sad story of the plight of the starving villagers:—

Those of your readers who have met with cases of starvation will have an idea of what we see here daily—those large glassy eyes, those sunken cheeks, those long bony arms, and skin that lies like drapery over the bones. Many, if not all, have sold all they possess. Numbers of them can be seen daily going to the relief camps, most of them with only a wrap round their loins. No one can say they do not work. Let me give an instance. I see daily a large number of women known as coolie coal-bearers. They begin work at daybreak and continue until dusk, with a very short interval for rest, carrying baskets of coal, each weighing about 30lb., from the railway station to a mill, a distance of a quarter of a mile, at a quick pace. These women like all others of the poorer class, have, after the day's work is over, to grind the grain and prepare it before they can have a meal, and they must rise early in the morning and do the same before going to work. Is there a worse form of slavery? And yet I have noticed these women in ordinary times going along the roads laughing and chatting with each other. Their wages amount to the enormous sum of 3d. and a fraction per head per day. The majority of the men earn on an average 4d. each per day, and most of them have to keep a family upon it. I have never heard any of them complain either of their condition or treatment.

There is not much evidence here in support of the theory that famine relief is too leniently and too lavishly given.

The *Manchester Guardian* of Monday last published a striking letter from Mr. A. Redford, dated Nagpur, February 22, upon the condition of the famine districts. "The people at home, says the writer, cannot have any idea of the amount of suffering the Natives have endured for a considerable length of time.

They have been waging a war which has been more terrible in its effects than any war with the sword—a war, not for territories, but against pestilence, famine and death. For over three years plague—one of the most dreadful calamities—has been carrying off thousands of people, rich and poor alike. One day a man might have been seen going about as usual, in full health, and the next day he might be seen a distorted corpse. It is still with us, and shows no sign of abating. Since it broke out there has been one famine of food, and now we have not only a food famine, but a water famine as well. When food is scarce one can put up with one meal less per day; but who can do without water, especially in a country like this, where the thermometer rises in some places to 117 degrees and the hot winds blow like a furnace blast? I do not know that the world has ever had its parallel. Just before the crops were gathered I went over this district, and was saddened by the sights on all sides. The cotton trees were only half as plentiful as usual, and the quality was quite weak. Jewar, the chief food of the cattle, instead of growing to a height of 8 feet, was not more than 3 feet or 4 feet, and in many cases only a few inches high, the whole being quite thin. So was it with all other crops.

Mr. J. E. Mathieson, whose letter will be found in another column, addresses to us a series of four questions, to which we have the pleasure of returning concise answers, which may prove useful to other readers as well. Mr. Mathieson asks:—

"1. Is it the fact that an enormous tribute of £20,000,000 sterling is spent in Great Britain, drawn from the sweat of the brow of the Natives of India? Can you, from official sources, substantiate this fact? No colony of our Empire would for a moment tolerate an exaction of this nature."

There was published last year a Blue-book entitled "East India: Accounts and Estimates, 1899-1900—Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India" (C.—9399). On page 18, under the heading "Home Charges" is set forth "an analysis of the net Expenditure in England charged on the Revenues of the year, with the exchange added." The Budget Estimate for 1899-1900 on this head is given at £16,324,500 sterling, *plus* Rx. 8,550,000 (say £5,700,000) for Exchange—to say nothing of the impoverishment of the country by private remittances.

We recently quoted John Stuart Mill's remarks on the effect of spending money raised in a country outside that country. It is worth while to hear Sir George Wingate, a most experienced Anglo-Indian official, on the same point:—

Taxes spent in the country from which they are raised are totally different in their effect from taxes raised in one country and spent in another. In the former the taxes collected from the population . . . . are again returned to the industrious classes. . . . . But the case is wholly different when the taxes are not spent in the country from which they are raised. . . . . They constitute . . . . an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount withdrawn from the taxed country . . . . might as well be thrown into the sea . . . . such is the nature of the tribute we have so long exacted from India. . . . . From this explanation some faint conception may be formed of the cruel, crushing effect of the tribute upon India. . . . . The Indian tribute, whether weighed in the scales of justice, or viewed in the light of our own interest, will be found to be at variance with humanity, with common-sense, and with the received maxims of economic science.

"2. Can the late Sir W. Hunter's statement be approximately verified, that 40,000,000 of our Indian fellow-subjects are normally in the condition of never being able to satisfy fully their cravings of hunger?"

Lord Lawrence said (1864) that "the mass of the people were so miserably poor that they had barely the means of subsistence." Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., Secretary to the Government of India in the Agricultural Department, wrote (1880): "Except in very good seasons, multitudes for months in every year cannot get sufficient food for themselves and their families." Sir Charles Elliott, Chief Commissioner of Assam, wrote (1888): "I do not hesitate to say that half the agricultural population do not know from one year's end to another what it is to have a full meal." Sir William Hunter's statement (1881) attracted so much attention that the Secretary of State directed the Government of India to institute an enquiry into the general condition of the rayats. The reports amply confirmed this statement.

"3. Is it, or is it not, true that the annual average income of Indians as a whole does not amount to £3 per annum—the mere weekly wage of multitudes of English and Scottish workmen?"

In 1882, Lord Cromer (then Major Baring), Finance Minister of India, said in his Budget speech: "It has been calculated that the average income per head of the population in India is not more than Rs. 27 a year; and, although I am not prepared to pledge myself to the absolute accuracy of a calculation of this sort, it is sufficiently accurate to justify the conclusion that the taxpaying community is exceedingly poor" . . . . "quite sufficient to show the extreme poverty of the mass of the people." It is believed that the calculations in question were made by Sir David Barbour. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's calculations work out at only Rs. 20.

"4. Is it, or is it not, true that in the villages of India—and India is a nation of villages—the public granaries are mostly falling into decay? Why?—Because there is no reserve of grain to garner, the people's poverty being too awful to admit of their keeping such stores of grain in reserve."

Mr. Mathieson himself answers this question. We will add a little extract from Sir William Wedderburn's brochure, "The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast" (1897); reprinted from INDIA, (February, 1897):—

I say that the mass of the cultivators have no store of grain in their houses. They used to have. In the earlier days of my service every rayat, however poor, had an underground store of millet put away, enough to keep his family for a year or two. But these little stores are now impossible, being swept away by the bailiffs in execution of the decrees of the civil debt courts which, to the destruction of the peasantry, we have set up on the English model in the rural districts. Nor are the rayats any better off as regards cash or credit. They not only possess nothing, but less than nothing, being for the most part hopelessly in debt to the village money-lender.

The *Pioneer* has a long article in laudation of the outgoing Governor of Bombay, but in spite of the goodwill with which it is written, the portrait is not unlike that sketched by Lord Sandhurst's critics. His kindness of heart, his courtesy, his activity are admitted by all. It was strength of will that was wanting. The *Pioneer* candidly says:—

Lord Sandhurst, in short, was no match for the Treasury, which forced him not only to spend every penny he could raise, short of reducing permanent establishments, upon plague and famine measures, but in his turn to impose heavy burdens upon local bodies which were not allowed a voice in the lavish expenditure. It is ill fighting with the Financial Department; but a stronger Governor would have made his voice heard in a way that would have staved off the spectacle of municipalities pauperised, the public faith impaired and departments starved to inefficiency.

As for the campaign against sedition, which the *Pioneer* approves, it says:—

It is doubtful if Lord Sandhurst would have acted so vigorously

as he did without external pressure. He was spurred on by the Government of India.

But weakness in an Indian Governor has often worse effects than wickedness.

If the departure of Lord Sandhurst has revived memories of the harsh measures employed in plague-stricken districts at the time of the first outbreak, the farewell given to Major Reade at Poona reminds us of the turn of the tide, and of the great success which resulted from a policy which secured the co-operation of the people. At the meeting of plague workers to bid good-bye to Major Reade, Professor Gokhale sketched the despair which had settled down on Poona at the time of the second epidemic, and the renewal of hope which followed the arrival of Colonel Creagh. The Colonel, loyally seconded by Major Reade, soon won the confidence of the people and when that was won, the battle was half over. When Major Reade was left in sole charge, he distinguished himself, not by trying to gain distinction by some drastic and showy policy, but by the reasonable and moderate way in which he used the great powers placed in his hands.

The *Bengalee* relates a surprising case of assault by Europeans, with a sequel which in any other country but India would be more surprising still. Two Europeans named Sibold and Meares were sitting on the parapet of a bridge. Some Chokidars salaamed as they passed, but an old man named Gurdoyal Mahats, riding by on a pony, failed to do so. The two Europeans stopped the pony, but the Indian refused to salaam, and an altercation ensued. According to the prosecution Mr. Sibold gave the old man several blows, but for the defence it was urged that he was only pushed. In any case the old man fell and died soon afterwards. When he was dying, the defendants assisted him, and showed some contrition. They were sentenced to fines of 1,000 and 100 rupees respectively; 500 rupees out of the fines being awarded to the old man's widow.

In the case of the Tinnevelly rioters the High Court have decided in favour of the contention of the Government that they have the right to suspend trial by jury as regards these particular prisoners. As the acting Advocate-General put it, "the Legislature when it authorised the classification of offences, also authorised the classification of persons who committed the offence." The *Hindu* views this decision with great regret. It says :—

> It is possible that jurymen of a certain standard of intelligence may not be able to satisfactorily deal with certain grave crimes; but this inability can operate only in regard to certain classes of cases, and not in regard to cases where the offenders belong to a particular caste or profession.

The *Hindu* fears that the power now assured to the Government may be used to obtain convictions in cases in which the police or local officials are biassed against the accused.

The predominant temper of the higher powers is reflected in the reports of the working of the Municipalities in Bengal during the past year. There is a marked tendency to place emphasis on the weakest side of the institutions, with a certain forgetfulness of the English love of fair-play. It is curious to find that the province increased in population and in wealth, and yet that the ratepayers declined to the number of 2,000. The Magistrate of the twenty-four Parganas has an explanation ready and pointed :—

> Municipal Commissioners fail in the duty of adequately assessing the ratepayers for fear of being unpopular, and the result is that a large number of men who can afford to pay either escape taxation or pay much less than they should.

Now, where is the evidence for this invidious charge? And, if it be true, where is the organisation to bring the peccant Commissioners to book? We hope the Commissioners will at once call upon the Magistrate to substantiate the charge; or else that the Government will satisfy the public on the point. It is also curious that Mr. P. Nolan, Commissioner of Rajshahi, should find municipal conditions so different from the experiences of others. "Municipal institutions," he reports, "have taken deep root in this Division and produced excellent results." It should be worth while to explore the causes of this remarkable difference. Sir John Woodburn appears to think there is something to be said on both sides; he is judiciously glad to "note the achievement of undoubted, if not very conspicuous, improvement." Yet is not even that much something to the good? And how much more might be expected from a little sympathetic treatment?

If a touch of kindly sympathy is not to be rashly hoped for, at any rate a practical hint may be taken from certain remarks by Mr. Erskine, the experienced Commissioner of Sindh, on the memorable resolution of May 18, 1882. Mr. Erskine wrote :—

> I have seen so much good work done by these independent Committees (that is, the village Panchayats) that I certainly have never been able to understand the oft-repeated cry that Natives of this country have no capacity for self-government. It is only when their own Panchayats are Europeanised and converted into Municipal Committees that Natives cease to take an interest in municipal matters. Nor is this to be wondered at, for the members of Municipal Committees find themselves smothered in Acts and Rules, Budgets and Bye-laws, till they cannot venture to do anything, while at the same time they have no real authority to compensate for this, for they cannot punish, neither can they tax.

When local municipalities extort even a qualified certificate of progress, under the circumstances of their existence and operation, this is surely something to be thankful for. But it is to be remembered that the reports depend very largely upon the spectacles of the reporter as well as upon the actual facts as seen in the white light of truth.

At the annual meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom (March 13), Mr. Joseph Walton, M.P., moved,

> That this Association urges the desirability of separating the railway accounts of India from the general finances of that Empire, and is of opinion that exceptional expenditure caused by famine and plague should not be allowed to delay the construction especially of feeder lines, which there is every reason to believe would not only pay well in themselves, but also increase the profits of the main trunk lines with which they connect.

China is not enough for the enterprise of Mr. Walton; he now attacks India. It does not matter much, one way or another, about the separation of the railway from the general accounts: the real thing is to get intelligible and clear statements, which seems to be a hopeless desideratum. It is all very well to say that famine and plague "should not be allowed to delay" the construction of more railways. If the Treasury is empty, where is the money to come from? Will Mr. Walton build lines on credit? And who would get the anticipated profits? Mr. Walton has no thought for India, apparently, except as a quarry to be exploited by British capitalists. There is no hurry for more railways of any kind till the people of India are able to build them out of their saved rupees. Happily, Mr. Bryce was present and spoke words of good sense on he subject. But a gentleman from Liverpool and another from Blackburn supported the motion, which was duly carried, and reported to Lord Salisbury and Lord George Hamilton.

In the March number of the *North American Review* Mr. A. Henry Savage Landor, the traveller in Tibet, sets forth with some caustic comments and illustrations "Chief Causes of Discontent in India." Here and there, it may be, one might hesitate to accept his conclusions; but the article might be studied with distinct advantage, especially in official circles. He roundly charges the Government with pertinacious concealment of ugly facts. Thus :—

> For some years it has been the policy of the Government to hide from the public anything that might bring criticism on the doings of its officials; and the people have so far been astoundingly ready to swallow, in perfect faith, all that has been served to them. . . . . One thing in England that must strike a travelled man is the absolute lack of knowledge on the part of the Government and the majority of the people regarding our colonies, especially those in Asia. This ignorance . . . . must to a certain extent be excused, since it is caused by the incompetency of the officials there employed.

With South Africa in his eye, Mr. Savage Landor insists strongly on the right selection of men to represent our interests in India. After giving some serious examples of the unfortunate conduct of some officials, he says :—

> If one points out these facts concerning our officials, it is merely to show that if we continue to pour into India men unfit to govern—men who, like our Intelligence Department in South Africa, mostly through ignorance and self-reliance, grossly misinform the Government—no doubt we shall find that sooner or later we shall have in India a disagreeable surprise, which will be even less expected, and probably more felt, than our Transvaal trouble.

Especially striking are Mr. Savage Landor's remarks on the overbearing and brutal behaviour of certain at least of "the younger lot of 'civil officers.'" Finally, "there is, so far, no cause for immediate alarm, yet let England be on her guard."

"MELANCHOLY MEANNESS."

ON more than one occasion recently we have dealt with the injustice arising to India from the compulsory maintenance of a military garrison beyond the reasonable necessities of the country. We took pains to make it clear to the most perverse eyes that we had nothing to say against the employment of an ample defensive force. "It would be the height of folly," we said (Feb. 9), "to underman the garrison so as to give head, or to suggest foolish and mischievous hopes, either to internal discontent or to external aggression." But when the provision goes beyond this, it is an excess that requires strong and specific justification, "especially," as we said, "in these days of famine, plague, and multiplied distress." It was with much satisfaction, therefore, that we noted Mr. Herbert Roberts's proposed amendment to the Address, representing the necessity of relieving the Indian exchequer "from some portion of the large military expenditure incurred by the maintenance" of the British garrison. Mr. Roberts was fully justified in using the famine as a lever to advance his contention; but, apart altogether from the peculiar circumstances of the moment, the claims to relief has a solid foundation in equity. We maintain that, famine or no famine, the existing system is not fair to India. Mr. Roberts's amendment, however, did not then come on for discussion. Another opportunity offered when the House went into Committee of Supply on the Army Estimates for the year 1900-1. Mr. Roberts, accordingly, set down his proposition in a somewhat altered form :—

> On Army Estimates, to call attention to the organisation of her Majesty's Forces in the East; and to move, That the Military Appropriations in aid, paid by the Government of India in respect of Home Effective and Non-Effective Charges, are unjust and excessive, and that, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a portion of the British troops stationed in India should be considered as a Reserve Force for the protection of British interests in the East, and be charged upon the Imperial revenues.

In the earlier form of his motion Mr. Roberts, it may be remembered, specified 20,000 as the "portion" of the British garrison that ought to be treated as an Imperial reserve. The difference, however, is in the meantime immaterial, for the motion has again gone off as being "not in order."

Anyhow the question cannot be allowed to sleep, and no doubt some more favourable opportunity will be found for presenting the Indian argument and taking the sense of the House upon it. "The primary object of the maintenance of a large force in India," said Lord Hartington (Duke of Devonshire) on July 31, 1882, "is the security of our rule in India." On this point there is no dispute whatever, except of course as to the extent of the epithet "large." Both Briton and Indian agree thoroughly that "the security of our rule in India" is not to be in the slightest degree imperilled, but is to be maintained intact and unassailable. Unhappily for India, there does not seem to be any satisfactory means available for the decision of the question how strong this "large force" ought to be. As we have already shown, the present strength is considerably beyond the existing needs, so far as evidence is open to anyone outside the inner counsels of the India Office. If there be any grounds for this very heavy charge upon the exhausted treasury of India, they ought to be made known to the public; for, if they commended themselves to public acceptance, the India Office would be relieved of the odium that attaches to an apparently well-founded grievance, especially when India is prostrate under a combined and prolonged attack of famine and plague. The proportions of British and Native elements in the Indian army established on the recommendations of the Royal Commission of Enquiry of 1859 were palpably, and necessarily, based on the conditions revealed by the Mutiny; and the Commissioners expressly stated that their recommendations were made in reference to "present circumstances." But, though the circumstances have changed most materially for the better, these proportions still remain unaltered; and not only so, but, as Professor Gokhale pointed out in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure (April 12-13, 1897), there is (or there was) an excess of British troops over the accepted standard of proportion amounting to 11,338 men—an excess entailing on India a needless yearly charge of 1½ crores (or, more exactly, Rs. 1,57,30,000). Now this is no light matter at any time, apart from famine and plague. But Mr. Gokhale pressed the point deeper :—

> The strength of our existing army is, further, in excess, by the recent increase of 30,000 troops, of the military needs of the country, as laid down by the Army Commission of 1879, who even contemplated among other things, in framing their estimate of our requirements, "the contingency of operations beyond the frontier, not merely against Russia with Afghanistan as our ally, but against Russia assisted by Afghanistan," and, as Mr. Ilbert and Sir A. Colvin in their dissent point out, no circumstances have risen which necessitated these augmentations.

After the Mutiny, indeed, the establishment of British troops in India was gradually reduced from time to time, as the Commission had obviously contemplated, and in 1882 it stood at 60,000. This reduction, General Chesney says, was made "under financial pressure." The addition of 10,000 British troops and 20,000 Indian in 1885, General Chesney also states, was necessitated by "the advance of Russia up to the frontier of Afghanistan and the liability involved—then imminent and henceforward to be kept in view—of being called on to aid in the defence of that country." Yet, as has been seen, this was a second provision for a contingency that had already been provided for, and a contingency that was only an excited speculation. It would be difficult to find a better illustration of the need for some competent and permanent committee to deal with such matters on consistent principles, which do not appear to govern the India Office Military Committee which is supposed to advise the Secretary of State.

But the Indian army is not merely a force established for the purpose of maintaining "the security of our rule in India." That is only its "primary object." Let us quote further from Lord Hartington's speech (July 31, 1882):

> It is important besides that we should be able to proclaim to the world that our military forces in India are maintained not solely as a garrison, but that they form part of the forces of the Crown, and are able to support the policy of this country, at all events in all cases in which the interests of India are concerned.

That is to say they constitute an Imperial force as well. Now there can be no objection to this view so far as it is expressed by Lord Hartington, provided always the natural consequences are sufficiently borne in mind and admitted in practice. We have seen that contingents of the Indian army have been freely employed, since the formal and direct rule of the Crown was inaugurated, in many expeditions beyond the borders of India for Imperial objects in which India was more or less (or not at all) interested—to China, New Zealand, Abyssinia, Perak, Malta, Afghanistan, Egypt, the Sudan, Mombasa, Suakin, and now South Africa. With regard to the present case, beyond a hesitating suggestion of the importance of the Cape to India, the only frank assertion of an Indian interest in the Transvaal campaign has been made by Lord Lansdowne, no doubt under stress of official necessity for an argument more respectable than the selfish clamour of those notable Imperialists the Natalians. Speaking at Sheffield (November 2, 1899), Lord Lansdowne said :—

> Nor should it be forgotten that India has a special interest in the Transvaal question. A considerable number of the Queen's Indian subjects are to be found in the Transvaal, and amongst the many misdeeds of the South African Republic I do not know that any fills me with more indignation than its treatment of these Indians—(hear, hear)—and the harm is not confined to the sufferers on the spot, for what do you imagine would be the effect produced in India when these poor people return to their own country and report to their friends that the Government of the Empress, so mighty and irresistible in India, with its population of 300,000,000, is powerless to secure redress at the hands of a small South African State?

Well, this indignation is creditable to Lord Lansdowne as a man, as an Englishman, as an Imperialist, and as an ex-Viceroy of India. But it is a very impotent ebullition for a Secretary for War in an Imperialist Government. He knows very well that the Government would never have moved a single soldier to redress the abominable treatment of these poor Indians. He knows that successive Colonial Ministers—that is to say successive British Governments—have given away the rights of these poor Indians under the Convention of 1884. He knows that Natal has behaved not a whit less badly to the Indians within her borders, and he knows how little he has done to assist the Colonial Secretary to move his little finger on their behalf. Such an *ex post facto* Pecksniffian utterance to an audience totally ignorant of the facts is nothing less than a disgrace to British statesmanship and an insult to the sufferings of our Indian fellow-subjects. In point of fact, the first thing the Indian contingent should have been set to do was to compel the Natalians to redress the British

Indian grievances. The whole argument is of a piece with the miserable hypocrisy that has become in some quarters a second nature in dealings with the people of India. Either India comes within the Imperial circle, or she does not. If she does, she is entitled to Imperial treatment on an equal footing with the other parts of the Empire. If she does not, let her understand precisely what her position is—whether a ward in trust or a helot conquered and enslaved. India pays to the last pice for her internal peace and her external protection. She is proud to be able to render service in Imperial affairs, whether in China or in New Zealand or in Africa. But it is high time for our statesmen to see to it that, when she takes part in Imperial expeditions, she shall be adequately considered in the allocation of the costs. In so far as the Indian army is an Imperial force, it ought to be maintained at the Imperial charges. Again, we quote from the letter of the Government of India, dated March 25, 1890—the period of Lord Lansdowne himself and of Lord Roberts:—

> Millions of money have been spent on increasing the army of India, on armaments, and on fortifications, to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursions of the warlike people of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East. . . . It is imperative, in our opinion, that the long-standing question should be settled, and that the people of India, who have no voice in the matter, should not be able to complain that an excessive military tribute is demanded from the revenues of their country.

Again we repeat, "Let us have done with all this most 'melancholy meanness'."

"FROM SEA TO SEA."[1]

UNDISMAYED by the anathema which Robert Browning once pronounced on such "resurrectors," some unnamed publishers have disinterred letters of travel and other papers which Mr. Kipling wrote in 1887 and 1888 from the "decent seclusion" of the newspaper files in which they were buried. But that is not the whole of their offence. They have "seen fit to embellish the work with additions and interpolations." We must sympathise with Mr. Kipling's indignation, even if we question whether, in taking the revenge of an authorised edition, he has really consulted best for his fame. It does help an author's immortality that his collected works should fill a large number of volumes. De Quincey, for example, has probably suffered from the sixteen volume edition, which includes so much indifferent magazine work along with some of the most attractive prose in the whole range of English literature. "From Sea to Sea" is only journalism, as Mr. Kipling himself doubtless judged in not reprinting it sooner. It is scarcely worthy then of the honours of the "Uniform Edition" in scarlet cloth and gilt tops to which it has been promoted.

The work suffers from another disadvantage in appearing now, to which it would not have been exposed if it had been reprinted earlier. Mr. Kipling's style has naturally found imitators. And though it would be an exaggeration to say that "All can raise the flower now for all have got the seed," there has certainly been one disciple who in this particular department has rivalled the master. The late Mr. G. W. Steevens, as an "impressionist" traveller, had all the merits and all the faults of Mr. Kipling. A brilliant scholar, knowing far too well what good style meant to admire himself the sort of thing he set himself to do, he saw exactly what his public liked, and he imitated Mr. Kipling's brilliant dashes of colour, cock-sureness and jauntiness, as perfectly as he would have imitated the more difficult virtues of an ode of Pindar.

The first half of the first volume, under the title of "Letters of Marque," contains an account of a holiday spent in Rajputana. The letters are full of varied interest. One side of the versatile author, for instance, comes out in the description of a visit to the extensive stables of the Mahárájá of Jodhpur. But the palm for beauty and delightfulness must be given to the accounts of Chitor and Boondi. Of Chitor by moonlight he attempts no description, preferring to keep his memory of it "as a love letter, a thing for one pair of eyes only." But of Chitor by daylight he gives some splendid and imaginative word-painting. It is to Kipling the poet, not Kipling the journalist, that we may ascribe the account of the tower and the doctrine which the builder of old "wrote in sentences of fine stone." Still better, perhaps, is the description of the palace of Boondi, looking, from the main roads of the city, "like an avalanche of masonry ready to rush down and block the gorge." And best of all is the picture of the Treasury of Boondi—"a picture clinched and brought together by a winking brass hookah-bowl of quaint design, pitched carelessly upon a roll of dull red cloth in the foreground. The faces of the accountants were of pale gold, for they were an untanned breed, and the face of the old man, their controller, was frosted silver."

"From Sea to Sea," the next series of letters, fills the greater part of the two volumes, and gives us Mr. Kipling's impressions of travel in Japan and America. They are, of course, eminently readable, and they have in full measure the faults and merits already mentioned as characteristic of their author. It is amusing by the way to observe how, if you expel sentiment with a pitchfork (as Mr. Kipling is apt to do) it will still return. Readers of "Stalky and Co." will remember how its three heroes, waging brutal war against everything of the nature of sentiment, were strangely overcome with indignant emotion at the outrage done to their most sacred feelings by an M.P. glibly discoursing on patriotism. There is a similar unexpected sacrifice to sentiment in these pages. Mr. Kipling is filled with passionate horror and disgust at the thought of a well-dressed woman of Chicago looking on unabashed at the unlovely mysteries of the great meat-preserving establishment.

"The City of Dreadful Night" is a description of the seamy side of Calcutta—"realistic" in the most gruesome sense of that versatile word. One can only regret that Mr. Kipling should have reprinted this paper. It is not easy to see what is to be gained by such realism as this, which is only justifiable when it is employed by a moralist with a definite aim in view.

"Write me as one that loved his fellow-men." Mr. Kipling has somewhat audaciously put Abu Ben Adhem's noble motto upon his title-page. It would be ungenerous to say that Mr. Kipling must mean that he loves to observe his fellow-men, for he can hardly have proposed so to debase one of the most precious lines in all poetry. We prefer to say that he sometimes dissembles his love. Yet he is too full of race-prejudice and class-prejudice, of contempts and unbeliefs, to be truly sympathetic. His political philosophy is the merest cynicism. Constitutions, for instance, are to him only "a new plaything" in the East, and the West "the skittles we have played with for six hundred years." Mr. Kipling means well, but he has still much to learn before he can expect the Recording Angel to accede to his request.

[1] "From Sea to Sea and Other Sketches." Letters of Travel. By Rudyard Kipling. Two Vols. London: Macmillan and Co.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

LONDON is again celebrating a British victory. "By the help of God and the bravery of the British troops," telegraphed Lord Roberts last night, "we have gained possession of Bloemfontein." The pious acknowledgment with which the message opens has happily escaped the ridicule of commentators at home. It is only when President Kruger resorts to the phraseology of the Cromwellian epoch that we are treated to exclamations against the unctuous hypocrisy of the Pharisees. Sir Wilfrid Lawson would have those appeals to the Almighty left out altogether, holding as he does that the new religion is even more disgusting than the new diplomacy. Perhaps he is right, but one is almost grateful to Lord Roberts in this instance for following the devout example of the Boer statesmen. His action may convince some people that an expression of religious sentiment is not necessarily a symptom of cant and humbug. Lord Roberts can scarcely be accused of having underestimated the extent of his success. Its political importance is in his eyes so great that he already speaks of the "late" President, the "late" Executive, and the "late" Secretary of the Orange Free State. The only interpretation to be placed on this necrological phraseology is that in Lord Roberts's opinion one of the two Republics with which we are at war has ceased to exist. That being so, it may be regarded as certain that a renewed effort will be made to obtain from Lord Salisbury an early statement as to the character of the future administration of the conquered territories.

Mr. Balfour's voice trembled on Tuesday evening as he read the impassioned appeal for peace addressed to the British Government by Presidents Kruger and Steyn. Behind him sat Mr. Chamberlain, dumb but radiant. "The blood and the tears of the thousands who have suffered by this war and the prospect of all the moral and economic ruin with which South Africa is now threatened make it necessary for both belligerents to ask themselves dispassionately and as in the sight of the Triune God, for what they are fighting and whether the aim of each justifies all this appalling misery and devastation." So ran the preamble of what may properly be described as the Boer manifesto. Its solemnity deeply affected the Tory leader whose voice as he recited the words sank to a troubled whisper. Suddenly the whole temper and tone of reader and audience underwent a transformation. "This war," the document went on to declare, "was undertaken solely as a defensive measure to safeguard the threatened independence of the South African Republic, and is only continued in order to secure and safeguard the incontestable independence of both Republics as sovereign international States." The Colonial Secretary on hearing the closing words of the sentence threw his head back with a gesture of scorn and laughed aloud. The signal was eagerly welcomed by his admirers on the back benches who at once raised a shout of imitative derision. Mr. Balfour, although startled, responded to the shock like an unwilling steed to the stimulus of the lash. Subduing his squeamishness he proceeded with the recital with an air of ironical gravity.

Nevertheless, the House of Commons could not listen unmoved to words and phrases which continued to breathe a lofty spirit of piety and of faith in the ultimate justice of a higher Power. "If her Majesty's Government is determined to destroy the independence of the Republics" the Presidents had telegraphed "there is nothing left to us and to our people but to persevere to the end in the course already begun in spite of the overwhelming pre-eminence of the British Empire, confident that the God who lighted the unextinguishable fire of the love of freedom in the hearts of ourselves and of our fathers will not forsake us, but will accomplish his work in us and in our descendants." Sentiments expressed in this spirit are out of fashion in the British Parliament. Members listened to the unfamiliar strain with a sense of bewilderment, half-inclined to laugh or to seek relief in a Parliamentary "Oh, oh," and yet compelled in a shamefaced way to maintain an attitude of silent respect.

More in consonance with the taste of the House of Commons was the austere, passionless, and unpitying despatch in which Lord Salisbury, after analysing the emotional periods of the Boer appeal and finding them of no value, declared that "her Majesty's Government is not prepared to assent to the independence either of the South African Republic or of the Orange Free State." In this document the Transvaal Government was reminded that it had been accumulating for many years past military stores on an enormous scale, which by their character could only have been intended for use against Great Britain. "The result of these preparations," said the Prime Minister in one of the most significant passages of his reply, "carried on with great secrecy has been that the British Empire has been compelled to confront an invasion which has entailed upon the Empire a costly war and the loss of thousands of precious lives. This great calamity has been the penalty which Great Britain has suffered for having in recent years acquiesced in the existence of the two Republics." Needless to say, those ominous recriminations were received by the Ministerialists with every symptom of joy. The Liberals on the other hand sat silent and troubled. Apart from Mr. William Redmond only two members of the Opposition raised their voices against the policy of bleeding the Republics as "white as veal." Mr. Labouchere, in a speech that was bitterly resented and subjected to constant interruption by Tories below the gangway, asserted that there had been no parallel to the action of the British Government since Poland was blotted from the map. Even the Sultan of Turkey in his treatment of vanquished Greece, he declared, had taught us a lesson in magnanimity. Quite as forcible was the protest of Sir Wilfrid Lawson who detected in the attitude of the Government a revelation of the sinister motives by which the war had been inspired from its inception.

Curiously enough, the first enthusiasm of the Conservatives for Lord Salisbury's declaration cooled as quickly as it had been inflamed. Later in the evening when they had had time to talk the matter over, distinguished Ministerialists could be heard complaining that their leader had bamboozled them. His despatch was described in one quarter as a bundle of ambiguities. "What does he mean by saying that the Government are not prepared to assent to the independence of the Transvaal?" was a question which appeared to be on the lips of nine men out of ten. From the very outset of the long controversy Downing Street has insisted more or less strenuously on the vassalage of the Boers; yet here was the Prime Minister actually putting forward the ancient plea as a proof of his determination to be done with all the old nonsense about magnanimity and so forth. The fact is that the extremists on the Ministerial side will be content with nothing short of an out-and-out declaration in favour of annexation. Their suspicion of Lord Salisbury's latent honesty of purpose is ineradicable. For a different reason the Liberals also are disposed to regard the document as inconclusive and unsatisfactory. Their view is that it commits the Government to no definite policy and at the same time fails to offer the Boers the slightest inducement to lay down their arms. It is quite possible that both parties may yet unite in demanding a more explicit statement of their intentions from this most happy-go-lucky of Ministries.

Intense indignation has been provoked throughout the country by the surrender which the police in various towns have recently made to the rule of the mob. Mr. Cronwright Schreiner's tour in Scotland and the north of England has been marked by "red ruin and the breaking up of laws." At Edinburgh, Glasgow, Newcastle, Gateshead, and Scarborough meetings called to promote a settlement of the war have been stormed by organised bands of rowdies. Many conferences of a semi-private character have had to be abandoned in consequence of the threats of those truculent disciples of Imperialism, while the property of peaceable citizens has been wantonly wrecked for no better reason than that the unfortunate owners were suspected of holding "pro-Boer" views. So sinister an outbreak of mob-violence has probably not been witnessed in this country since the days of the Gordon riots. The irony of it is that one of the very grievances which we are seeking to redress by this war, according to the plea of its apologists, is the denial by President Kruger of the right of public meeting in Johannesburg.

"I do believe in Freedom's cause
As far as away as Paris is,"

seems to be the motto of the new Imperialism, the organs of which were certainly far more severe in their denunciation of mob-law in France in the height of the Dreyfus crisis than they have been of late in respect of the equally scandalous outrages witnessed as near our own doors as Exeter Hall. Many Conservatives and, with few exceptions, all Liberals are relieved to know that the matter has at length been taken up by the leader of the Opposition.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE FAMINE.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, February 24.

The burning topic of the day is still famine. All other topics dwindle into insignificance in comparison with its solemn gravity. The Viceroy spoke most feelingly and fully on this subject at the great public meeting held in Calcutta on the 16th instant, and the telegraphic summary of his speech must have made the English public tolerably conversant with the prevailing distress and hardship among millions of her Majesty's subjects in this country. It is matter for deep satisfaction that the Viceregal appeal has been so heartily responded to by the Lord Mayor, and that as much as £80,000 have been subscribed within a week, including donations from her Majesty the Queen and other members of the Royal family. Here, too, the sum of 5 lakhs has been raised at Calcutta, of which a lakh and a-half is contributed by that well-known philanthropist, whose name is beginning to be a household word in the land, the Mahárájá of Darbhanga. Closely following in his wake, the Mahárájá of Hatwa has contributed a lakh of rupees. The merchant princes of the metropolis, too, have come forward in aid of the relief of the unfortunate with

unstinting hand. The Rallis have liberally subscribed Rs. 30,000, which with the sum contributed by the Bombay firm, makes up the magnificent donation of 50,000 rupees. The Viceroy is all energy and sympathy on the subject, which he has made his personal concern. He has thoroughly identified himself with the cause and has risen to the gravity of the situation with a sympathy and benevolence which have not only elicited admiration but greatly established the prestige of the Indian Government for enlightened benevolence.

Nearly four millions of people are now on relief works or in receipt of gratuitous relief. From the latest return, up to 10th inst., issued by the Imperial Government, it appears that the number on relief works has greatly increased since January 20 last. The statistics are as under for all India, including Native States:—

	On Relief Works.	On Gratuitous Relief.
January 20	29,95,919 ..	518,675
February 10	31,95,371 ..	581,711

Those on relief works in British territory on February 10 numbered 25,10,390, and in Native States 684,981; while the number gratuitously relieved was 446,736 and 134,975 respectively. Taking the Bombay Presidency itself the number in three weeks has gone up from 750,000, in round numbers, to 950,000.

This is a most deplorable state of affairs; and what is in store for the unfortunate during the coming months need not be anticipated. One is appalled at the contemplation of future prospects till nature has once more been generous and shed her bounty in due course. But when all is said there remains behind *the* question of questions. We may take it for granted that the Government will be able to cope with the calamity and do all in its power to save human life to its uttermost resources. But what after the famine? As Mr. Digby has so well put it in that admirable letter to the *Bombay Chronicle*, is it impossible to prevent famines in the future. That is *the* question. Will it be solved? Will there be enough far-sighted statesmanship at headquarters to grapple with this great and ever growing agricultural problem? Will they admit what every rational being now admits that it is not so much a question of food grains as of means to buy food grains? How about the yearly diminishing resources of the peasantry? How about the curtailment of his nourishing food? How about his debility, physically, which makes him less and less productive? How about his rackrents? How about those precious revenue and survey settlements which are at the the root of the peasants' woes, and which alone have brought into the field the money-lenders. These and many other kindred questions have to be answered. And I ask again whether there is enough statesmanship at headquarters to solve this problem of problems?

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

"NOTORIOUS FACTS."

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—There is, I fear, much "beating the air" in the attempt to secure reform of the government of our Indian Empire; the compact phalanx of officials and military men will resist all attempts to enlighten the British people about the wrongs of India. I believe the persistent reiteration and recital of certain scandalous evils must be given over and over again until the notorious facts are well rubbed into the public mind. You know full well that Indian officialism hates the spread of information about that unhappy country.

1. Is it the fact that an enormous tribute of £20,000,000 sterling is spent in Great Britain, drawn from the sweat of the brow of the Natives of India? Can you from official figures substantiate this fact? No colony of our Empire would for a moment tolerate an exaction of this nature.

2. Can the late Sir William Hunter's statement be approximately verified that 40,000,000 of our Indian fellow-subjects are normally in the condition of never being able to satisfy fully their hunger cravings?

3. Is it, or is it not, true that the annual average income of Indians as a whole does not amount to £3 per annum—the mere weekly wage of multitudes of English and Scottish workmen?

4. Is it, or is it not, true that in the villages of India—and India is a nation of villages—the public granaries are mostly falling into decay? Why? Because there is no reserve of grain to garner: the people's poverty being too awful to admit of their keeping such store of grain in reserve.

The *pax Britannica* is urged as a reason why the Indian peoples should be content with their sad lot; and our rule of India is held up to the admiration (?) of Europe as the grandest spectacle of foreign rule that the world has ever seen! Early in this century Lord Teignmouth, when Governor-General, made the wise remark, "a people will prefer to be badly ruled by their own Native princes, rather than be better ruled by strangers;" but if *not* better ruled, I ask, how long will blundering and extortionate rule be submitted to?

The reluctance of the British Parliament to entertain the claim of Ireland to have its share of Imperial taxation readjusted and diminished, may remind Indian reformers how difficult is their task in the teeth of vested interests and shallow Secretaries of State.—Yours, etc.,

James E. Mathieson.

58, Ladbroke Grove, Notting Hill, W.
March 12, 1900.

[A reference to this letter will be found in "Notes and News."—Ed. India.]

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

OVER 4,600,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received (March 12) the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine:—

Number of persons employed on relief works increasing everywhere. No change of any importance in situation. Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 1,229,000; Punjab, 252,000; Central Provinces, 1,422,000; Berar, 318,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 139,000; Rajputana States, 415,000; Central India States, 125,000; Bombay Native States, 431,000; Baroda, 63,000; North-Western Provinces, 3,000; Punjab Native States, 7,000; Central Provinces Native States, 42,000; Hyderabad, 158,000; Total, 4,604,000. Madras figures wanting.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

Down to Wednesday night the Mansion House Fund for the famine sufferers amounted to £131,550 and the Lord Mayor during the day made another large remittance to the Viceroy.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (March 10) of the *Investors' Review*:—

Subjoined is the list and amount of subscriptions received for our little fund up to date. May we again repeat that it is a fund, every farthing of which will be put to good uses, especially in helping the starved cultivators to replace their lost cattle, and that the more help we can give in this direction the sooner will the distressed provinces and Native states—for they cannot be forgotten in the present misery—recover some of their ancient prosperity? Cheques and postal orders should be drawn to A. J. Wilson, crossed Union Bank of London, Famine Fund Account.

List of Subscriptions.

Allan O. Hume, Esq., C.B.	£10	0	0
Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.	25	0	0
Sir W. and Lady Wedderburn	25	0	0
Lady Hope	10	0	0
Indian Charity Fund	20	0	0
Miss Simpson	1	0	0
J. E. T. Allen, Esq.	5	0	0
H. J. H.	5	0	0
Mrs. C. Tremenheere	2	0	0
Miss Helen Huntingford	0	10	0
Messrs. Ledger & Hall, Horsleydown	3	3	0
C. O. Booth, Esq., Woolwich	1	1	0
W. J. H. Whittall, Esq.	1	1	0
John Coles, Esq., London	5	5	0
A. J. W., London	5	0	0
J. Abdool, San Fernando (per Manager of India)	1	0	0
A Subscriber, Edinburgh	1	1	0
F. T. Bennett, Esq., London	1	1	0
A Friend	1	0	0
Miss Reaves	5	0	0
X. Y. Z., London, E.C.	52	10	0
Danby S. Christopher	10	0	0
An Old Friend	0	10	0
G. A. Schott	1	0	0
Miss Thomson	1	1	0
Lord Provost Mathewson, Dundee	5	0	0
A. P. Mathewson	5	0	0

J. Mathewson	£5	0	0
G. Mayall	5	0	0
W. B.	0	10	0
Mrs. N. G.	0	10	0
"B"	10	0	0
"Ceylon"	5	0	0
Rev. E. T. Hamel	1	1	0
Mrs. Hamel	1	1	0
E. A. Elliot	0	4	0
Charles Wilson	5	0	0
R. C. Greig	2	0	0
"Q." (For Indian Famine Children), per Mrs. W. Martin Wood (per INDIA)	5	0	0
Dadabhoy & Co.	50	0	0
Thomas Hodges (gardener) and Family, per INDIA	0	10	0
A Friend	0	5	0
Total to date	£294	4	0

A GLASGOW FUND.

A meeting of citizens called by the Lord Provost was held in Glasgow on Monday, to raise funds for the relief of sufferers by the Indian famine. The meeting, presided over by the Lord Provost, was attended by representative citizens. His lordship, in introducing the subject, said the present famine was almost unparalleled. We had an appalling famine three years ago, but that of to-day was vaster than the one then. In a letter addressed to him by Lord George Hamilton, the Secretary for India said:—"The area now affected is estimated at 445,000 square miles, as against 350,000 square miles in 1897; the population affected is 181,500,000, as against 49,000,000 in 1897." These figures in themselves seemed to him the strongest arguments that could be adduced to call forth their sympathies with these sufferers, and to do what they could to meet and mitigate their sorrows. Resolutions were adopted giving expression to profound sorrow at the calamitous famine that has overtaken Rajputana and other large areas of our Indian Empire, and requesting the Lord Provost to open a relief fund in Glasgow. At the close of the meeting subscriptions were announced amounting to nearly £5,000.

MISS ALISON GARLAND ON THE FAMINE.

The following further letter from Miss Alison Garland, dated Calcutta, January 18, appeared in the *Morning Leader* of March 8:—

The war in South Africa occupies so much of public attention that other calamities are almost unnoticed. Yet, had there been no conflict with the Boers, the present famine in India would have awakened as much interest as the famine of two years ago.

Rain fell heavily in many parts of Northern India last Monday. This will mitigate the distress in some districts, and may save the spring crops. But in Rajputana the relief is very slight. The ground is so parched there that it has been impossible to plough it, so that no crops are sown. The distress already is great, but it is terrible to think what it will be when the hot weather sets in—in March, April and May. The villagers have been living on the leaves of the pepul tree, and on oilcake, usually the food of cattle. This diet so injures their digestive organs that when they come to the famine relief works ordinary food disagrees with them, and very often they die. Indeed, from this cause, and from utter exhaustion, deaths are so numerous on the relief works that the fires are kept burning night and day without intermission, to burn the bodies of the victims. In Rajputana, as in the Bombay Presidency and Baroda, the scarcity of water is added to the horrors of the scarcity of food. In ordinary times the rainfall is not great in these high lands. Many parts seem more like a desert than anything else in nature. But now this characteristic is common to wide tracts of what is usually agricultural land.

Here, too, the cattle are dying like flies. Even when offered at one rupee, *instead of fifty or seventy-five*, they fail to find purchasers. Relief works are opened, but many of the villagers die on their way to the works. The missionaries constantly have the orphans (children picked up alive by the side of their dead mothers) carried in to the mission homes. One mission at least that I heard of—the Presbyterian Mission—takes in all applicants. They have permission from the society at home to receive all the orphans placed in their charge. In ordinary times this could be done, including education, for three rupees a head per month. With famine prices prevailing, it now costs between four and five rupees a month. There are in India now considerably over three millions of people on relief works. Multiply this by twelve, and you will have some idea of the numbers of people who are feeling the pinch of scarcity.

A week or two ago I met an educated Indian who was going on a visit to Cambay. He promised to write and tell me of the condition of things in the West, and I quote the following extracts from his letter, which has just been received:—

"It is difficult to give you any idea of the havoc that famine makes. It is impossible to put down on paper the sufferings caused by want of food. Could I have given you some photographs of the poor people here, you might then have taken those pictures as a help to the British people to understand in what state India is when the crops fail. Or, could you induce any person desirous of understanding it, to cease from taking for one day his own meals, then judging from his own suffering of the feeling of these poor people, it would give him a better notion than any cold description that I could write on paper. As to individual instances of suffering, you must yourself have come across so many skeletons in which life hardly seems to be able to stay, that I am afraid if I were to enumerate my own experiences in that line, they would be of little further use to you. It must have struck you how very poor these people are. I am told that when scarcity began first to be felt, last June, people came to the bazaars with their brass pots and pans and sold them. These poor people have no capital from which they can draw when the time of need comes. Later on the bazaars were crowded with the rugs and bedding, and now you see men, women, and children shivering by the roadside or in their homes, without food or clothing. Perhaps some will suppose it is the fault of the people not to have saved when they had better crops. If so, I advise such people to consult some person who knows about the produce of land in India and what the cultivator gets in the best of seasons. They will find that the daily income of an agriculturist is less than that of a London street beggar. . . . . I am glad you are giving some facts about the famine to the British public. In this way those Englishmen who are not absolutely deaf to the appeals of a suffering nation may be able to better understand what a terrible calamity famine is for India and how fearfully helpless the people themselves are. If kindly disposed persons knew how small a sum contributed to the relief of these destitute villagers is required to keep them from dying I have no doubt many would be willing to curtail some of their luxuries, and feel happier after the sacrifice in the consciousness of having saved a fellow-creature from a painful and lingering death."

I can testify that Mr. Tyabji's statements are in no way exaggerated. We have truly in India to-day a famine more grave and disastrous than that of 1896-1897. As the weeks go on it will increase in gravity. Notwithstanding that many a heart is troubled by the news arriving from South Africa, I trust that some pity and help may be spared for our suffering fellow-subjects of the Queen in India.

A LARGE DEATH LIST.

The *Spectator* (March 10) writes: The accounts of the famine in India are still terrible. The Government report that in spite of the strictest precautions against needless demands the number of persons in actual receipt of relief approaches five millions, and the amount expended will exceed five millions sterling. This is, we imagine, exclusive of the sufferers in Native States, who are very numerous and peculiarly wretched. The officers employed "on famine duty" are worked almost literally to death, and some of their narratives are heartbreaking, the people in some districts being reduced to skin and bone, and the children, who are commonly plumper than English children, appearing as wretched atomies, too reduced even to cry. The mothers apply for relief too late, and the cattle die in such numbers that milk is hardly procurable. The relief system is ably organised, the people are strangely patient and obedient, and the officers exert themselves as they would in a battle; but the death list will necessarily be large, more especially among the thousands whom not even famine will induce to quit their villages for the relief works.

BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA.

AN UNSPOKEN SPEECH.

We comment elsewhere upon Mr. Herbert Roberts's motion, relating to the British army in India, which was to have been moved in the House of Commons on Monday last, on going into Committee on the Army Estimates, but which was unfortunately ruled out of order. The Motion was to have been seconded by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., and supported by Mr. Buchanan and other members. We are enabled to give below the notes of the speech which Sir W. Wedderburn had intended to deliver:—

The point raised by his hon. friend the mover was part of a big question, viz., the apportionment of charges between India and the Imperial exchequer. That question had been referred to the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, of which he had the honour to be a member. The Commission would now report in a few days. He would not anticipate their recommendations, but he would draw attention to the conclusions of Mr. Fawcett's Select Committee on Indian Finance which reported in 1874. That Committee laid great stress on financial justice to India, and quoted with emphatic approval Lord Salisbury's declaration that "the most effectual way of securing financial justice for India was for the House of Commons to be constantly watchful on her behalf." He thought, therefore, his hon. friend was performing a useful duty on the present occasion. The question they had to consider was how financial justice could be done to India in the matter of military expenditure. The question was an intricate one, but one thing was clear, viz., that it was unfair to place upon India the whole cost of maintaining Imperial supremacy in the East. It was convenient to use India as barracks for troops required for Imperial purposes, as in China and South Africa. There was no objection to that. But that was not a reason for charging India with the whole cost of those troops. It was convenient to have military camps in Surrey and Sussex, but no one thought of charging the County Councils with the cost. The right principle was that the Imperial exchequer should pay for the protection of Imperial interests, India, like other parts of the empire contributing her fair share according to the advantages enjoyed from such protection. And it must always be borne in mind that of all our Imperial interests the maintenance of British supremacy in India itself was the greatest. To this important fact Lord Curzon recently bore witness, when he said, "India is the pivot of our empire. If this empire lost any other part of its dominions we could survive, but if we lost India, the sun of our empire would be set." It was therefore clear that the Imperial exchequer should in justice bear at least a share of the cost of maintaining British supremacy in India. But when we looked to past history we found

that the whole cost of establishing British authority, and the suppression of the Mutiny, had been placed upon India. Quite a different policy was followed as regards colonial wars, the whole cost being borne by the Imperial exchequer, even in the case of the Canadian rebellion of 1838-43. Again, there were the wars beyond the Indian frontier, as for example the Afghan wars. With regard to the last Afghan war Lord Salisbury declared that it was "an indivisible part of a great imperial question." Yet India was made to pay the cost, some £20,000,000, only receiving from the British Treasury a contribution of £5,000,000. Then there were the minor wars beyond the Western and North-Western frontiers. From an official return it appeared that £13,000,000 were spent on such wars between 1882 and 1892, the whole being paid by India. Lastly there was the increase of 30,000 men, dating from 1885, the time of the Penjdeh incident. This was in excess of the force held to be sufficient by the Army Commission of 1879 for defence against Russia combined with Afghanistan, and was protested against at the time by two members of the Viceroy's Council as being unnecessary; and, if necessary, a charge which should fall on the Imperial exchequer. If the British Treasury had borne its fair share of all this expenditure there would not now be a National debt pressing upon the people of India. As regarded the future a practical question arose, What should be the test by which the shares payable by the Empire and by India respectively could be ascertained? He thought a good test had been indicated by Lord Kimberley in a speech he made at the Mansion House. He very properly stated that this country was determined to maintain British supremacy in India, and then went on to say that that supremacy rested on three bases, the last and most important being "the magnificent European force which we maintain in that country." This was no doubt true, and furnished a useful practical test of Imperial requirements, for *primâ facie* the Imperial exchequer should bear the charge of the Europeans employed specially to maintain British supremacy. In asking the House to deal liberally and even generously with this matter, he would remind honourable members of the extreme poverty of the Indian masses, and he would also point to the manifestations of loyalty shown by them even in the midst of their own sufferings.

THE LATE MRS. GOSTLING.

It is with deep regret that we have to record the death, which took place at Bombay on February 13 last, of Mrs. Sarah S. Gostling.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress at its meeting on Tuesday last unanimously adopted the following resolution:—

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress desire to express their deep regret at the decease of Mrs. Gostling, a true friend of India. Not only did she take a very useful and active part in all public movements, but by the social kindness shown towards Indian ladies did much to create sympathy between Europeans and Indians, and to draw together all classes of the community.

The Chairman is requested to send a copy of this Resolution to Mr. Gostling.

An Indian correspondent writes:—Mrs. Sarah S. Gostling was a distinguished woman of letters and took a leading part in social and educational reforms. She was known to all India, for the last thirty years; for during that period of her life she devoted her abilities to the progress, social and moral, of India and her people. She exercised great influence over the people. In 1890 she worked as an Honorary Secretary to the Women of India Age of Consent Memorial Committee. In 1891 she was an Honorary Secretary to the "Anti-Usury League." The Society asked that the Deccan Relief Act should be extended in order to include within its scope the protection of domestic servants, poor clerks and others who might have fallen into the hands of the money-lender. The benefit of the extended Deccan Relief Act was that it was to be made applicable to those not included under the Income Tax. On November 29, 1892, in company with Miss Pash, B.A. (Girton College), Mrs. Gostling went on an educational inspection-tour to Poona, Calcutta, Allahabad, and other places to see how far education among the women of India was advanced. She found that India with regard to this question was something like England forty years ago, when men thought that higher education was not fitted for women, nor women fitted for it. Education, of course, was more advanced in England than it was here, but there were in England as in India many who thought the education of women an unnecessary expense. Here I may recall a letter of Mrs. Gostling's on this question:—

"I happened to be at Allahabad, during the sitting of the Eighth Indian National Congress, and what struck me most was that out of an assembly of over 5,000 people, from all parts of India, all with a language their own, the one district not understanding the language of the other district, English was the language they all understood, and the proceedings were therefore conducted in English, and the speeches of one or two in Sanskrit at the Social Conference had to be translated into English. This Social Conference, it was considered by many, should be the sole object of the Indian National Congress, but others thought people become agitated when social subjects are discussed. The Age of Consent Bill proved this, and the Indian National Congress therefore decided that social questions should not be discussed at the Congress, as a day is left for each section to discuss these questions by themselves, after the meetings of the Congress. I was much struck by the fluent English and concise thought of the majority of the speakers."

Mrs. Gostling was the writer of "Reports and Extracts on the Board School System," also "Why it takes less to Cure a European of Ignorance than it does a Native," and other papers. She lectured on such subjects as "Women and Work *versus* Men and Work," "Philanthropy," "Women's Clubs," "Hindu Child Marriage" (not betrothal), "The Increase of Silk in India," "Happiness," "Biology," etc.

In 1889, while in England, she was nominated local manager of Tower Street Group of Schools, by the London School Board. She was a member of the National Indian Association, Ladies Branch, Bombay. She had so much at heart the cause of anti-vivisection, and she devoted the latter part of her life so much to a crusade against the cruel practice of wanton slaughter of the dumb animals, that in spite of her indifferent health, she was strenuously working with zeal to prevent any institute that had anything to do with vivisection in India. From 1898 till her death she was one of the two Honorary Secretaries of the Indian Anti-vivisection Society. She worked very hard when the successful campaign against the scheme for a Pasteur Institute in India was going on. She worked for the Anti-vivisection Society till two and three o'clock in the morning. Her last ambition was that a "league of mercy" might be organised in India for the good of men and animals, but alas! she was taken away suddenly from this world.

The late lamented lady was distinguished for her efforts for the improvement of the position of women as regards property and civil and political disabilities.

India and her people, to say nothing of the dumb creation, will miss her courageous and outspoken advocacy, and ever remember with gratitude her eloquent speeches in the cause of mercy.

THE LONDON INDIAN CONFERENCE.

MR. PILLAI AND THE "DAILY CHRONICLE."

Commenting on the recent London Indian Conference the *Daily Chronicle* wrote in its issue of March 2:—The extreme views on the subject of Indian famines expressed at the Conference of Indians at the Westminster Town Hall yesterday are calculated to do the cause that was advocated more harm than good. These views were embodied not so much in the resolution passed as in the speech of the chairman, who filled Mr. Naoroji's place. It is not the case that famines seldom occur in Native States; one of the districts most affected by the present famine is the Native State of Rajputana. Nor is it true that they are less disastrous there than in British India. It is true enough that famines are preventable in the sense that if as much money was spent annually on poor relief in India as is spent in England, no loss of life would occur until the population had overtaken the margin allowed it. It is also true that the home charges are a heavy drain on the resources of India. The country obtains in return a good, though expensive, administration; but some economy might be effected on the military side by charging England with such part of the defence as is required by Imperial exigencies. It is probable that it is in this direction that the only practicable scheme of reform and retrenchment lies.

In its issue of March 8 the *Daily Chronicle* published the following rejoinder from Mr. Pillai:—

To the Editor of the "Daily Chronicle."

Sir,—My attention has just been drawn to your criticism on my speech delivered at the Conference of Indians recently held at the Westminster Town Hall, in which you challenge two of my statements—first, that famines are less frequent in Native States than in British India; and, secondly, that they are less disastrous in their effects. In answer to your criticism I would invite your attention to three tabular statements published in the Report of the Indian Famine Commission of 1880. These statements refer to a period of 109 years, running from 1769 till 1878. The first of them describes the area of drought and the area of famine or scarcity separately, and if you will run your eyes down this statement you will find that while there have been twenty-two years of drought and twenty-two years of famine or scarcity in British India there have been only twelve years of drought and thirteen years of famine or scarcity in Native States. You will also observe that, while on every occasion there was famine or drought in Native States British India was also similarly attacked, there were several years in which Native States entirely escaped from famine, drought, or scarcity. The second statement shows that the number of famines or scarcities has been four in Bengal, nine in North-West Provinces and Punjab, eight in Rajputana and Central India, nine in Bombay, and eight in Madras, and that the number of years in which these places were affected by famine were five, nine, nine, ten and ten respectively. The third statement shows that in 1803, 1824, 1845 and 1873 no famines occurred in Native States, while the area and population affected in British India were as follows:—

Year.	Area.	Population.
1803	20,000*	8,000,000
1824	110,000	18,000,000
1845	25,400	3,400,000
1873	54,200	21,400,000

In 1832, 1837, 1853, 1860, 1865, 1868 and 1876 there was famine both in British India and Native States; and the following comparative statement shows that the famine generally was of a less severe character in Native States:—

	Population affected.	
Year.	British.	Native States.
1832	21,000,000	1,100,000
1837	21,500,000	6,600,000
1853	8,000,000	2,000,000
1860	19,100,000	1,200,000
1865	45,900,000	1,700,000
1868	29,700,000	14,700,000
1876	56,400,000	1,900,000

In the figures for 1876 I have included Mysore as British, as that State was under the management of the Government of India. A careful examination of the above figures will prove the accuracy of my statements. It is impossible to give an accurate account of the loss of life by starvation during these years, but a table compiled mainly from official statistics shows that the total loss of life from 1833 to 1878-79 is 12,700,000, a large proportion of which occurred in Native States.—Yours faithfully,

G. P. Pillai,
Chairman, Indian Conference.

26, Doughty Street, W.C., March 6.

To this letter the following editorial note was appended:—

[The methods of registration are well known to be more imperfect in Native States than in British India.—Ed. *D. C.*]

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, March 8.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE COLLECTION OF LAND REVENUE IN FAMINE DISTRICTS.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India whether any general instructions had been issued by the Government of India to be lenient in collecting the land revenue from cultivators in the districts affected by famine:

And, whether he was aware that in the Alibagh District of Bombay special promptitude in payment was being enforced, and that an unusually large number of notices had been issued to defaulters at a cost to them of four annas for each notice.

Lord G. Hamilton: The Famine Codes lay down that the collector in the early stages of a famine, is to consider the question of suspending the land revenue in distressed tracts, and empower him to grant such suspensions of his own authority.

I have received no information to the effect suggested in the hon. member's second question.

Sir W. Wedderburn: Will the noble lord make enquiry?

Lord G. Hamilton: If I receive any authentic information in support of the statement.

THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES AND INDIA.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, upon the recommendation of the Premier of Western Australia, the Australian Colonies were considering the payment of a grant of £20,000 from the public revenues towards the famine in India:

And whether any decision had been arrived at in reference to this suggestion.

Mr. Chamberlain: I have received no information on the subject.

TEXT-BOOKS IN UNAIDED SCHOOLS.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to a recent Circular of the Government of India in the Educational Department, under which unaided schools were required to make use of text books approved by the Director of Public Instruction, under penalty of the exclusion of their pupils from public examinations:

Whether he had sanctioned this new departure:

And, whether he would state what advantage was obtained from limiting the free choice of text books by schools receiving no grant from Government.

Lord G. Hamilton: The Resolution of the Government of India, to which the hon. member refers, has not yet come before me officially for sanction though I am officially cognisant of its contents. It is there stated that, in the opinion of the Government of India, the State, while it does not undertake to prescribe text-books for unaided schools, is justified in excluding from the examinations for certificates and for Government scholarships, the pupils of schools which use text-books disapproved by Government; and that this is done on the ground that the State has a direct interest in the course of instruction given in all schools, whether aided financially by the State or not.

PROPOSED "IMPERIAL GUARDS."

Mr. Malcolm asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the services rendered to the Empire by the Indian and Colonial troops now serving in South Africa, he would recommend that her Most Gracious Majesty should create a body of Imperial Guards, who should technically form the body guards of her Majesty's representatives in India and the Colonies.

Mr. Powell Williams: The Secretary of State is not prepared to make such a recommendation at present.

Monday, March 12.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

NATIVE INDIAN REGIMENTS ON THE ESTIMATES.

Mr. Buchanan asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether the two Native Indian regiments to be borne on the Estimates were existing regiments at present forming part of the Native army in India, or were they to be raised in India by the British Government.

Mr. Powell Williams: The Imperial Government defrays the actual charges for recruiting as claimed by the Indian Government in the case of these regiments, instead of paying a capitation grant.

INDIA AND THE ARMY ESTIMATES.

Mr. Wyndham, in the course of his speech introducing the Army Estimates, said: With regard to the additions to the establishment, there were 10,000 to replace the soldiers transferred from the Indian to the home establishment. This covers all those who have been borrowed for the purposes of the war, and it also covers two battalions of Native infantry who have been borrowed from the Indian establishment to take the place of British battalions at Ceylon and Singapore. . . . . There is one other proposal which I ought not to keep back from the House. That is that the garrison of Mauritius will in future consist of one British battalion and of two battalions of the Native Indian infantry. We are not borrowing those battalions from India. They will provide, for the first time, a very small foreign service roster for the Native Indian army. India will raise two more Native battalions than she would otherwise do, and we will take them, just as India takes from us the fifty-two white battalions. . . . . The only item in this large demand for increased store accommodation which imposes a new obligation which is in any sense a point of policy is covered by a sum of £48,000, but I must tell the House that this is the first instalment of what will prove to be a much larger sum. It is for increasing and distributing the store accommodation for clothing and munitions of war. We have been going very carefully into that question; we have been sitting from day to day, in fact, upon that question. We are determined that the outbreak of war shall never again find this country with such a small reserve of stores and munitions of war. (Cheers.) But if you increase that reserve, you have to increase the storehouses in which would be placed; and since it would be folly to pile up such reserve in Pimlico, it will be conveniently distributed in various parts of the United Kingdom. That is a question of policy which will involve a great deal of expenditure. This accounts for the whole of this increase on the normal estimate. There is nothing in it which need engage the attention of the House, except the borrowing of the two battalions from India for colonial stations and this determination on our part to increase the reserves of stores and munitions of war.

Mr. Bartley asked if any part of the charge for these two battalions would fall on India.

Mr. Wyndham: Oh, no! . . . . I think it is agreed that, dealing with the infantry of the Regular Army, we ought to have as many battalions at home as there are abroad. (Hear, hear.) That has been the idea aimed at by this and preceding Governments for more than thirty years. (Hear, hear.) If that is so we have only to agree, if we can, upon the number of battalions abroad and the necessity for them, and then by doubling that number we shall arrive at the proper figure of the infantry battalions of the Regular British Army. India first claims our attention. Is it true that our presence in India is due to a recent policy of Imperial expansion? (Hear, hear.) Of course not. The battalions of the army of occupation in India account for fifty-two infantry battalions. Will anybody say there is any prospect of reducing the garrison in India? Then there is Mauritius. We went there in 1810, when there was an expedition under Lord Minto from India. Mauritius accounts for only one battalion. Will anybody say that we should abandon that station which is on the route to the Cape, India, and Australia?

Sir C. Dilke, in the course of his speech, said that it was certain now that the colonies would join us in any great war in the future, and it would be well, therefore, to arrange for such co-operation in time of peace. But the Government had taken steps in the opposite direction by cutting down in 1896 the contributions from the tropical colonies in the East towards defence. It was impossible to consider the present system apart from the question of its cost, and the system was condemned by its cost, present and prospective, and by the difficulty of obtaining recruits. In 1897 the cost of the defence of the British Empire was sixty-three millions sterling, even when the rupee was reckoned at its selling value. In the present Estimates the cost of the defence of the Empire would be seventy-five millions and a-half. But if, according to the Treasury's view, the rupee were to be reckoned as having the full purchasing power in the East of 2s., then the cost for the year would be eighty-one millions and a-half. And that enormous expenditure, so vastly greater than that of any other Power in the world, was not complete, for it did not allow for a future increase of the garrison in South Africa and for a necessary rearmament.

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, in the course of his speech said: I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman bear testimony to the general efficiency of the present system of enlistment. I was particularly interested by what he said of his own experience as a Commissioner of Chelsea Hospital. This is a matter which has been discussed again and again in this House during the last thirty years, and I am afraid most people have not been sufficiently impressed by the great fact that has impressed the hon. gentleman—namely, that where we have to garrison tropical countries we cannot do it with long-service men. (Hear, hear.) We know, of course, that it used to be done to some extent in the old East India Company days, that the Presidency troops were sent out and kept there until they were worn out by disease and the effect of the climate; but it was a cruel system, for those who did come home were only a miserable remnant. I say it was a cruel and inhuman system and it could not be done on so large a scale as we require. (Hear, hear.) The same consideration

applies to those ingenious persons who argue in favour of the short-service system for home purposes, with some sort of special long-service enlistment for India. A man may remain in India for some such period as five or seven years and yet come home a good man, but if he is kept longer he is a man who is lost for all practical purposes. I was glad to recognise the ability with which the hon. gentleman spoke on that subject, and I was pleased that he bore testimony to the general excellence of the present system. Looking back, as very few of us in this House now can, for thirty years to the days when Lord Cardwell carried his measure through the House, it is a perfect marvel to us how much he was able to do in the course of a very few years against the very strongest opposition, and how very satisfactory it is to find that although, of course, mistakes were made and exaggerations were committed no doubt, still in the main it was a beneficial agent in maintaining the security and therefore the prosperity of the Empire.

Colonel Milward quite approved of the raising of new regiments in India, and thought such troops might well be used for service in our Eastern possessions. The occupation of Chitral and the extension of our territories towards the frontiers of India, he said, had locked up many of our troops in Northern India and the time would come, even when the troops from India now in South Africa had returned, when we should be obliged to increase the number of British troops in India.

Tuesday, March 13.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HOWITZER BATTERIES IN INDIA.

Mr. Arnold-Forster asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was proposed to horse the 5·4 howitzer siege batteries now in India:

And, whether these siege guns were taken on manœuvres and to camps of exercises, and in what way they differed essentially from the 5-inch howitzer, which was not a siege gun.

Lord G. Hamilton: It is proposed to substitute horses for elephants and bullocks in the equipment of 5·4-inch howitzer batteries in India.

These howitzers are taken to manœuvres and camps of exercise.

They differ from the 5-inch howitzer in throwing a 60 lb. shell instead of a 50 lb. shell, while their total weight behind team is about 6 cwt. greater.

THE INDIAN WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. Arnold-Forster asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Indian War Department continued to insist upon the manufacture of a 5.4 howitzer, carrying a 60 lb. projectile, in view of the fact that there was no other gun of that calibre in her Majesty's service by sea or land; that the guns adopted by the War Office for service out of India were a 5-inch gun with a 50 lb. projectile, and a 6-inch gun with 100 lb. projectile;

And, would he explain what public advantage attaches to the retention of this weapon.

Lord G. Hamilton: I cannot say whether the manufacture of the 5·4-inch howitzer will be continued. It is not intended that more than two heavy batteries in India shall be armed with this weapon, and there are already in India a sufficient number of these howitzers for that purpose.

I fully recognise the importance of securing uniformity of pattern between the Indian and Home Services; but as has been stated more than once in this House, there were special grounds for the introduction of this particular howitzer. It has, according to the latest official report from India, proved itself a simple and powerful weapon, calculated to form a valuable addition to a field army; and its withdrawal from service would involve a serious sacrifice of public money.

CHIEF PRESIDENCY MAGISTRATE OF MADRAS.

Mr. Lloyd Morgan asked the Secretary of State for India, whether when the post of Chief Presidency Magistrate of Madras recently became vacant, it was given to an officer of the Madras police who had no judicial experience:

Whether similar posts in Bombay and Calcutta were always filled by lawyers of experience:

And, whether Mr. W. E. Clarke had invariably acted as Chief Presidency Magistrate of Madras whenever a temporary vacancy occurred within the last few years:

Whether he was so acting within a short time of the last vacancy occurring:

And, whether in the event of any such vacancy occurring in future in Madras, he would adopt the same course as that followed in filling the similar posts in Bombay and Calcutta.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have no knowledge of the appointment referred to in the hon. member's question. The power to make it rests entirely with the Government of Madras and I am not aware of any sufficient reason for interfering with their discretion and responsibility in the matter. I believe that in Madras there are recent precedents for appointing to this post, officers whose experience has been confined to police business, and that the results have been quite satisfactory.

INDIA AND THE ARMY ESTIMATES.

In the course of the resumed debate on the Army Estimates,

Mr. Buchanan complained that the Estimates submitted did not fully show anything like the liabilities the country would have to meet in consequence of the large increase of the forces. He thought the Under Secretary ought to give the Committee not merely the estimates for the present year, but what would be the total liability that would come upon the country when the scheme came into full operation. He asked whether the Government intended to produce a new Barracks Loan Bill this year. Again, what use was to be made of the colonial contingent after the war? A statement in the speech of the Under Secretary for War led him to suspect that there was a scheme in the background for a kind of permanent organisation of the military forces in the colonies which should be at the beck and call of the authorities here for service in various parts of the Empire, and he believed that this would cause jealousy in the colonies and would not tend to the unity of the Empire. He called attention to the fact that there was a constant growth in the numbers of the colonial corps, and charged the Government with the responsibility for this state of affairs, under which the cost of forces not British in character but drawn from a great variety of Native populations in different parts of the world were thrown on the British estimate. For these increasing colonial garrisons the aggressive and expansive policy of the Government was clearly responsible. He asked whether the regiments were to be taken for the general reinforcement of the military resources of the Empire. Could they be sent anywhere? Were they to be absolutely at the disposal of the military authorities? It was important the Committee should understand what were the conditions under which the Indian Government had agreed to part with two of its Native Regiments.

Mr. Powell Williams remarked that it was not a question of the Indian Government parting with any existing regiments. New regiments were raised for special service in Mauritius. Whether they would ever be asked to volunteer for service elsewhere if occasion arose was more than he could say.

Mr. Buchanan thought that if two regiments were wanted for Mauritius in the present emergency the authorities would have taken two trained regiments. In his opinion, to use India as a recruiting ground for the purpose of our own British establishment was a very questionable departure in our military policy. . . .

Mr. Buchanan, interrupting the Under-Secretary of State's speech in reply to the discussion, desired further information as to the engagement which had been made between her Majesty's Government and the Government of India as to these two Native regiments.

Mr. Wyndham said the British Government for many years past had recruited in India a Native battalion which had been stationed at Hong-kong. There were some objections to that proceeding, or, at any rate, to extending it, for it was never a good plan to have two people competing against each other in the same market. They had felt that, in some garrisons, particularly those in hot climates, there was a field for the employment of Indian troops side by side with British battalions, and in order to avoid competing in the recruiting market, they fell in with the wishes of the Indian Government and accepted two regiments, that Government to increase their force by two regiments. The cost would be borne by the Imperial Government. As he understood these two regiments were not earmarked, for others would be glad to follow in their steps.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

The following Notices of Motion appear on the Order Paper of the House of Commons:—

Sir W. Wedderburn,—Distress in India,—To call attention to the condition of the people of India; and to move, That, in view of the grievous sufferings which are again afflicting the people of India, a detailed and searching village enquiry should be instituted in order to ascertain the causes which impair the cultivators' powers to resist the attacks of famine and plague. [*Tuesday, April* 3.]

Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree,—Distress in India,—That the spread of famine and scarcity over extensive areas and affecting millions of inhabitants in India, although recurring at irregular intervals, may be regarded as a certain calamity to which that country is periodically exposed; that the disastrous consequences of such visitation are rendered unconquerable by the fact that an unusually large proportion of its population is allowed to remain dependent for its livelihood upon agricultural labour exclusively, whereas nearly all other industrial pursuits for which the natural resources of the country offer wide scope are neglected; that one of the most effective methods by which the rigour of the famines could be modified, and the buying power of the people now succumbing to them increased, would be to enable large classes of the agricultural population to pursue other industries; and that, therefore, it is the opinion of this House that the Government of India should adopt measures for the elementary, industrial, and technical instruction of the poorer communities, so as to fit them for more profitable manual labour in other directions besides agriculture. (An early day.)

Mr. Samuel Smith,—Excise Administration (India),—To call attention to the administration of Excise in India, by which many liquor shops are being opened in various parts of India, in direct violation of the expressed protests of the neighbourhood, and in contradiction of the declared policy of the Government of India, as formulated in their Despatch to the Secretary of State, No. 29, February 4, 1890; and to move a resolution. [An early day.]

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Notice has been given of the following questions:—

Sir William Wedderburn,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether he will lay upon the Table the Memorial of Kanty Chandra Mookerjee, addressed to him under date of December 22, 1897, together with the papers therein referred to. [*Thursday, March* 15.]

Sir William Wedderburn,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether he will specify the various forms of employment provided at the famine relief works:

And, whether he can state approximately the number of persons employed on breaking metal for roads, on excavating tanks, and on constructing embankments for railways. [*Thursday, March* 15.]

Mr. Stevenson,—To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether he is now able to report the result of the representations made to the Sublime Porte by her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople respecting the claims of British Indian pilgrims who were robbed and wounded by Arab brigands on the highway between Jeddah and Mecca in the years 1895, 1896, 1897, and 1898. [*Friday, March* 16.]

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN BOOK.—No. III.

The Proposed Separation OF Judicial and Executive Duties in India.

MEMORIAL

FROM

RT. HON. LORD HOBHOUSE, K.C.S.I. *(late Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).*

RT. HON. SIR RICHARD GARTH, Q.C. *(late Chief Justice of Bengal).*

RT. HON. SIR RICHARD COUCH *(late Chief Justice of Bengal, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).*

SIR CHARLES SARGENT *(late Chief Justice of Bombay.)*

SIR WILLIAM MARKBY, K.C.I.E. *(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta).*

SIR JOHN BUDD PHEAR *(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta, and Chief Justice of Ceylon).*

SIR JOHN SCOTT, K.C.M.G. *(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).*

SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P. *(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).*

SIR ROLAND K. WILSON, BART. *(late Reader in Indian Law at the University of Cambridge).*

MR. HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I. *(late Member of the Bengal Legislative Council).*

TOGETHER WITH TWO APPENDICES.

LONDON: PUBLISHED BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Price One Shilling (or 12 annas), postage 2d. extra.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies,

Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions during the Autumn and Winter Season.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, THE SECRETARY,
BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

New Volumes of the Uniform Edition of Rudyard Kipling's Prose Works.

FROM SEA TO SEA,

AND OTHER SKETCHES.

LETTERS OF TRAVEL, by RUDYARD KIPLING.

In 2 vols., extra crown 8vo, red cloth, gilt tops, 6s. each.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.